DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 245 CS 208 358

AUTHOR Riffe, Daniel; And Others
TITLE Cartoonists and Editors Look at Cartooning.
PUB DATE Aug 84
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (67th, Gainesville, FL, August 5-8, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cartoons; *Decision Making; Editing; Editorials; *Employee Attitudes; *Employer Attitudes; Employer Employee Relationship; Journalism; Media Research; Newspapers; Organizational Communication; *Role Perception
IDENTIFIERS Editorial Policy; *Editors; *Political Cartoonists

ABSTRACT

Questionnaires were completed by 96 editorial cartoonists and by 67 of their newspaper editors in a study of the journalistic autonomy and decision making participation of the cartoonist. It was hypothesized that (1) editors and cartoonists would agree on the cartoonist's role, and (2) cartoonists and their editors would differ significantly in their view on several specific autonomy factors, such as quotas, freedom from editorial constraints, and decision making processes. As predicted, cartoonists' descriptions of their role agreed with the editors' descriptions of the cartoonists' role (i.e., as critic, artist, entertainer, reporter, etc.). However, there was a contrast between how cartoonists thought the editors perceived the role and how the editors in fact perceived it. The cartoonists were more likely to use two different roles when describing their perceptions and their editors' perceptions, while the editors were more likely to use the same role to describe their own view and what they thought the cartoonist's view was. concerned the statement that cartoonists should be free from all editoral restraints. Most editors disagreed strongly. The two samples agreed that the cartoons published did reflect the paper's editorial policy. Both groups gave similar rankings to sources of ideas for cartoons, and both agreed on the importance of a quota in the production of good cartoons. More cartoonists believed, however, that the number of cartoons they were submitting was excessive, while none of the editors believed the quotas were excessive. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED245245

Newspaper Division

Cartoonists and Editors Look At Cartooning

Daniel Riffe
Assistant Professor, Coordinator
Mass Communication Research Center
Southern Illinois University

Donald Sneed
Assistant Professor
Department of Communication
Texas A&M University

Roger L. Van Ommeren
Associate Professor
Department of Journalism
and Mass Communication
South Dakota State University

Paper presented for the Annual Convention, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Gainesville, Fla., 1984.
Funding for this study was provided by the Graduate School, Southern Illinois University

CS 208 358

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Daniel Riffe
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

'Cartoonists and Editors Look at Cartooning'

This study examines editorial cartoonists' and editorial page editors' views on the cartoonist's: role, creative process, politics and place in decision-making.

The editorial cartoonist is an anomaly in the newsroom. Employed expressly to provide opinion and critical commentary, the cartoonist's job differs from the newsperson's whose every professional action is purportedly informed by dedication to objectivity.[1]

Perhaps because there are currently fewer than 200 editorial cartoonists working full time for American daily newspapers,[2] little systematic research exists on the editorial cartoonist, the cartoonist's relation to the work setting, and the products of the cartoonist's work. Exceptions include Hynds' 1976 profile of 86 cartoonists,[3] qualitative histories or reviews of artwork,[4] and a few cartoon "effects" studies.[5] Of course, cartoonists themselves have often provided entertaining autobiographical insights.[6]

Less neglected, comparatively, are the attitudes and beliefs of the newspeople in the work setting,[7] and the socializing forces[8] and informal and formal structures within that setting.[9] And while those studies have generally ignored cartoonists,[10] research dealing with newspeople's job satisfaction and autonomy is nonetheless pertinent to discussion of the cartoonist. The cartoonist, after all, is the individual in the organization who arguably merits most the label of "artist" and who may

have the greatest sense of or desire for personal or artistic autonomy.

What exactly is "autonomy" and how has it been utilized as a research concept in studies of news occupations and organizations?[11] Ziter has defined autonomy as the "degree to which (the) job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the individual in scheduling the work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out."[12] Johnstone has also viewed the potential for autonomy as a characteristic of the job or work itself; he related organization size to loss of opportunity for autonomy, "consistently a significant predictor of higher job satisfaction."[13]

On the other hand, Schwartz's autonomy is a property of a worker, an "inner-directed value" characteristic of newspaper managing editors.[14] Shaver has labeled autonomy--a sense of responsibility for one's own work--one of the strongest sources of job satisfaction among journalists.[15]

However, some have viewed the relation of autonomy to news work in a third dramatically different way. For example, recall that Flegel and Chaffee found that a reporter's personal opinions, though secondary to an event's newsworthiness, influence strongly the shape of a report;[16] Culbertson has cited such an influence as evidence of "high autonomy."[17] In his use of the concept, Culbertson makes explicit its relation to the unique constraints, conventions and demands of newswork; in his "news-orientation model," autonomy is "the extent to which a jour-

nalist's news-judgment decisions correspond with his or her own interest or preferences."[18] For Culbertson, then, autonomy is a freedom from editorial constraints and from an orientation toward the audience,[19] and is reminiscent of Merrill, who cites autonomy as the keystone of his "journalist's philosophy."[20]

The common dimension in all these conceptualizations of autonomy is freedom, particularly freedom in the actual performance of work. While reporters may eschew participation on personnel or budget decisions, they guard jealously their autonomy in their primary activity--reporting or writing the news. An example: three-fourths of the reporters in Johnstone's study claimed autonomy in writing, "thus confirming the presence of a widespread administrative taboo against overt interference with the newswriting process itself." Contrast this with higher level decisions: only half of Johnstone's respondents had control over work assignments.[21]

In some cases, of course, reporter participation in editorial conferences may be seen as an exercise of autonomy. Nearly two-thirds of Johnstone's reporters (64%) did meet daily with their editors.[22]

But the degree to which such participation may be equated with autonomy is variable, and likely involves, again, how work-related the consultations are. For example, Joseph found that while reporters prefer a "management-consult-reporter-but-management-make-decision" system in most matters, editors preferred even less reporter participation. Like Johnstone, Joseph found more reporter

autonomy in work-related matters than in higher level decisions.[23]

And of course individual reporter influence or autonomy in decisions also varies depending on the reporter's specialty,[24] "mode" of reporting,[25] activism[26] and status in the newsroom.[27]

This study attempts to further knowledge of journalistic autonomy and decision-making participation, by examining how the cartoonist feels about his/her work, with the following research questions: What is the role of the editorial cartoonist? How do editors and cartoonists view the cartoonist's work? How important are such autonomy factors as production quota, artistic freedom, origin of ideas and artwork in drawing cartoons? Finally, is there any conflict between the cartoonist's perception of his/her role and the perceptions of that role held by his/her editor, whose day-to-day operations are governed by what may be entirely different responsibilities, convictions and conventions?

The study is a departure from Hynds' 1976 description of cartoonists.[28] Like Hynds, we measured cartoonists' political leanings, but in order to explore these as possible points of contention between the cartoonist and his/her editor. Where Hynds reported on participation in editorial conferences (25% said "always"),[29] we tried to identify what cartoonists see as the optimal decision-making process. While Hynds allowed cartoonists to identify multiple "functions" of their work, we wanted to determine the single most important role that cartoonists ascribe to

themselves. We expand upon the earlier study's exploration of the cartoonist's sources of ideas, whose opinions cartoons should reflect, and the most important attributes of good cartoons.

The study's major improvement on the 1976 poll, however, is in its exploration of both the editorial cartoonist's and the editorial page editor's views. The study borrows its methodological perspective from the "coorientation model" of Chaffee and McLeod.[30] For example, the cartoonist's role is an object for coorientation. Two separate measures are taken for each dyad member. First, the person's view of the object is assessed, and second, the perception of the other person's view is estimated. These perceptions are then contrasted on three dimensions: agreement (an observer's assessment of the correspondence between Person A's view of the object and Person B's view of the object); congruency (similarity between A's view of the object and A's perception of B's view); and accuracy (the fidelity of A's perception of B to B's actual view).[31]

Two research hypotheses reflect the study's concerns with autonomy and role perceptions:

Hypothesis One: Editors and cartoonists will agree on the cartoonist's role.

Although they may "march to the beat of different drummers," there is no reason to predict that the editors and cartoonists would differ significantly in their general view of the cartoonist's role.

Hypothesis Two: Cartoonists and their editors will differ significantly in their views on several specific autonomy factors: quotas of cartoons, "ideal" or optimal cartoon-related decision-making processes, and freedom from editorial constraints.

These deal with the cartoonist's work. Like reporters who resist interference in writing, cartoonists will resist interference in deciding how many and how to produce cartoons.

'Method'

Questionnaires were sent to 180 editorial cartoonists, primarily those listed in the 1981 Editor and Publisher Yearbook roster,[32] during Summer 1983. A second mailing followed the first by two weeks. The cartoonist population was adjusted to 176 to account for a death, departures, and a failed newspaper. Ninety-six (55%) returned questionnaires.

Questionnaires were also sent to the cartoonists' 160 editors (some newspapers list two or three cartoonists), and 67 (42%) responded.

'Findings and Discussion'

Before exploring directly the hypotheses, brief mention of characteristics of the two samples may be illuminating. Of particular interest is comparison of Hynds' 1976 sample of cartoonists[33] with the 1983 sample. Hynds reported that 20% of his sample were in the 20-39 year age group; 63% were in the 40-59 group; and 17% were 60 years and older. The younger 1983 sample percentages were 41.4%, 35.6%, and 23% respectively, with a mean age of 46 and a range of from 22 to 82 years.[34]

And while nearly two-thirds (63%) of the 1976 sample called themselves political Independents (with 12% Democrats and 19% Republicans), just under half (46.5%) of the 1983 sample were Independents. The percentage of Republicans remained fairly constant across samples (18.6% in 1983), while the percentage of Democrats grew to 30.2%. (It is tempting, but imprudent, to herald a youth

movement or politicization in the profession; the self-selected nature of the two samples argues for more tentative interpretations.)

The 1983 and 1976 cartoonists differ only slightly in terms of productivity. Of the full-time cartoonists in the early study, 88% draw between four and six cartoons per week. The modal number of cartoons submitted (and published) for the 1983 sample is five, with 63% drawing between four and six. The mean number of cartoons was 6.2, reflecting the wide range on this variable (from claims of one cartoon per week to 50 per week).

Finally, the 1983 cartoonists are collectively younger than their page editors, if Hynds' age categories are used: 29% of the page editors in 1983 were in the 20-39 year age group, 64% were in the 40-59 age group, and 7% were 60 or older. Mean age, however, was similar at approximately 47 years. Editor ages ranged from 28 to 68 years.[35]

The first hypothesis predicted that cartoonists and editors would agree on the "role" of the editorial cartoonist. Measurement of the cartoonist's role--as seen by both cartoonist and editor--used the method of paired comparisons[36] of roles (critic, artist, reporter, teacher, entertainer, judge, and opinion leader).[37] Then the respondents were asked to select one label that best described how his/her "counterpart" would see the cartoonist's role. Two rankings of the roles were thus generated in each sample (see Table One).

While the rankings themselves are illustrative, confirmation of the first hypothesis comes from the between-rank correlations. As predicted, the rankings for the cartoonists' descriptions of their role agreed with the ranking for the editors' description of that role. The correlation coefficient[38] (Spearman's rho = 0.79, p l.t. .05) is a measure of that agreement.

But Table One data also reveal a great deal about the cartoonists' and editors' views of each other. In both samples, for example, role rankings suggest that the "counterpart" is attributed generally the same--a congruent--view of the cartoonist's role. The correlation for cartoonists (rho = 0.79, p l.t. .05) is slightly weaker than for editors (rho = 0.81, p l.t. .05). More important, however, is the inaccuracy revealed here, i.e., the contrast between the ranking for how the cartoonists think the editors perceive the role, and the ranking for how the editors actually described it (rho = 0.39, not significant at p = .05).

While evidence of congruency came from an aggregate-level analysis, evidence of incongruency from the cartoonist's point of view is presented in an individual-respondent analysis, also presented in Table One. Each sample was reanalyzed to determine, first, how many cartoonists used the exact same role to describe their own view and what they thought their editor's view was; and second, how many editors used the same role to describe their view and what they thought the cartoonist's view was. The cartoonists were significantly more likely to use two different roles than were the editors.

The second hypothesis predicted disagreement on several autonomy factors. Table Two data provide the basis for testing the specific subhypotheses.

The most dramatic disagreement was reflected in the response to the statement on cartoonists' freedom "from all editorial restraints." What is striking is not the cartoonists' agreement, but the intensity of the editors' disagreement (87% disagreed, 33% "strongly").

This disagreement may reflect not only basic differences on how autonomous the cartoonist should be, but to some extent the editor's perception of "freedom from editorial restraint" to mean a narrowing of the editor's own autonomy.

The two samples agree that the cartoons published do, in general, reflect the paper's editorial posture or policy. Somewhat surprisingly, the groups agree on the importance of a quota in the production of good cartoons. Less surprisingly, the samples were very similar in their ranking of sources of ideas for cartoons.

But significantly more cartoonists believed that the number of cartoons they were submitting was excessive. None of the editors, on the other hand, felt their specific quotas were excessive. More than a fourth felt the number of cartoons submitted was "too few."

The cartoonists and editors also differed significantly on the "ideal" decision-making situation for determining which cartoons were to be published. While the majority of each sample described as optimal a joint decision-making procedure, each also gave sec-

ondary preference to their own judgment; virtually no one in either sample was willing to relinquish totally their involvement.

Table Three explores in more detail the perceptions of the cartoonists and the editors. Here, however, cartoonists were asked their views on certain classes of issues, and to describe how the editor viewed the newspaper's position on those issues. The editors were asked to describe the paper's position and how they think cartoonists view the paper.

The cartoonists viewed themselves as significantly more liberal than their editors on each type of issue. On three issues (economics, defense and foreign policy), there was a significant difference between the cartoonists' description of nim/herself and the editors' description of the paper. The editors in all three cases described the paper as more conservative than the cartoonists saw themselves.

What is perhaps most telling, however, is the congruency of each sample's view with the other's view. There were no significant differences between the cartoonists' perception of the editors' view of the paper and the editors' perception of the cartoonists' view. This congruency was accompanied to some extent by accuracy; only on "foreign issues" was there significant difference between the cartoonists' perception of the editors' view of the paper and the editors' actual view.

In general then, the cartoonists see themselves as more liberal than their employing newspaper. Editors generally perceive the cartoonists' view of the paper as conservative, and in fact feel

the cartoonists describe the paper as more conservative than it is. Still, the cartoonists' perception of the editors' view is accurate, with the cartoonists misapprehending the editors' view only on foreign issues.

Table Four examines the two samples' beliefs on the importance of certain dimensions of the cartoon, i.e., how important each is to making a cartoon successful. As might have been predicted, certain "universals" were adhered to by both samples. For example, the groups agreed on the importance of "a moral purpose," "humor," and "a strong idea" in a good cartoon. Both agreed that the cartoonist should not depend on the caption to carry the cartoon. But interestingly, the two samples did differ significantly on the importance they ascribed to "good art" and "a good caption" in determining what was a good cartoon. The cartoonists saw the artwork as less important, but gave more importance to the caption.

'Conclusions'

This study has provided a current profile of samples of editorial page cartoonists and their editors, and has examined the samples' perceptions of one another. Also explored were the samples' views of certain practices and procedures which were related, presumably, to the concept of "autonomy."

In the aggregate, the two samples were in general agreement on the role of the editorial cartoonist, and each projected a congruent view to the other sample. Yet an individual-respondent analysis demonstrated that many cartoonists project an incongruent view to their editors. Cartoonists were more likely to perceive incongruency (whether real or not) than were editors.

The samples also disagreed on the desirability of total freedom for the cartoonists, the excessiveness of submission quotas, the "ideal" decision-making procedure, and the importance of "good" art and captions. Both editor and cartoonist described the cartoonist as being politically "at odds" with the employing newspaper (i.e., the artists were more liberal).

Ultimately, of course, we should measure the impact of these possible sources of misunderstanding between cartoonist and editor. Unfortunately, this study lacks the longitudinal perspective necessary to trace those who disagree with their editors on roles, quotas, issues, practices, etc., and to follow their career moves. Similarly, other research might be designed to take measures of job satisfaction, or of the cartoonists' sense of how these differences between themselves and their superiors impact their performance.

Nonetheless, individuals act and react on the basis of their beliefs--accurate or not--and the data demonstrated several potential points of contention that exist between cartoonists and their editors.

We can speculate on the implications for newsroom management of this disagreement, calling upon the comments of respondents in this study.

"The rare marriage of a cartoonist and editorial page editor who think alike must be blessed to behold. More often, the issue of editorial freedom must be hammered out," according to Jim Borgman,[39] editorial cartoonist for the Cincinnati Enquirer.

Among the possible strategies for resolution of conflict that are available to cartoonists and editors, two are of particular interest here: conformity and compromise.[40] From the superior's point of view in a superior-subordinate relationship, conformity is seen as the route of least resistance and is the route encouraged--overtly and indirectly--by newspapers. With what might be viewed as patriarchal organizational structure and familistic relationshps, processes of constraint and socialization, newspapers engender and reward conformity, and not autonomy.

Even the perhaps instinctive affinity toward compromise is thwarted, because the page editor may perceive such compromise as a relinquishment of his/her own autonomy. This autonomy of the editor is manifested, often, in the establishment of production quotas, dictating of cartoon subject matter, and generally, making of decisions on editorials, commentary and art.

But this reduction of the cartoonist to mere contributor to the page belies the cartoonists's self-image as "artist." Even decisions to place artwork in less-than-prime position may be perceived by the artist as sources of major conflict.

Of course, on the other hand the cartoonist's interest in the editorial page may be only to the extent that he/she is called upon to illustrate an editorial. Such cartoonists, however, are likely the exception rather than the rule.

Our data reveal cartoonists who seek to be unencumbered. Yet typically, autonomy is an ideal achieved only by a select few cartoonists who have achieved "star" status. Some of those few may

enjoy the high-autonomy, non-management espoused by Bob Stiff, editor of the St. Petersburg Independent, who says: "I allow our cartoonist to walk around most of the day with his hands behind his back. But I know what he's doing. He's doing a sketch of a cartoon in his head; he's thinking while he's on his feet."[41]

This would seem the embodiment of the cartoonist's dream: non-interference with his thinking and creating processes and an appreciation of his artistry. The autonomy the cartoonist seeks is likely not total, but rather the independence and freedom to have his opinions seen and heard, by both his audience and his editor.

Notes

1 Activist or participant perspectives notwithstanding. See: John W.C. Johnstone, Edward J. Slawski and William W. Bowman, The News People (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1967). Culbertson specifies interpretative, traditional and activist perspectives. See Hugh M. Culbertson, "Three Perspectives on American Journalism," Journalism Monographs, No. 83, June 1983.

2 According to Editor & Publisher International Yearbook (New York: Editor and Publisher, 1981).

3 Ernest C. Hynds, "Survey Profiles Editorial Cartoonists," The Masthead, Spring 1977, pp. 12-14; and, "Herblock, Oliphant, MacNelly Lead Cartoon Resurgence," Newspaper Research Journal, prototype edition: 54-60 (April 1979).

4 See, for example, Everette E. Dennis, "The Regeneration of Political Cartooning," Journalism Quarterly, 51:664-669 (Winter 1974).

5 Del Brinkman, "Do Editorial Cartoons and Editorials Change Opinions?" Journalism Quarterly, 45:724-726 (Winter 1968); and LeRoy M. Carl, "Editorial Cartoons Fail to Reach Many Readers," Journalism Quarterly, 45:533-535 (Autumn 1978).

6 See, for example: Herbert Block, Herblock On All Fronts (New York: New American Library, 1980); Randall P. Harrison, The Cartoon: Communication to the Quick (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1981); Jeff MacNelly, MacNelly, the Pulitzer Prize Winning Cartoonist (Richmond, Va.: Westover, 1972); or Patrick Oliphant, Oliphant! (Mission, Kan.; Andrews and McNeel, 1980).

7 See, for example, Daniel Riffe and Subhadra Belbase, "Decision-maker Views on Foreign News," Newspaper Research Journal, 4: 17-24 (Spring 1983). More formal organizational analyses are typified by Chris Argyris' Behind the Front Page (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974).

[8] Warren Breed, "Social Control in the Newsroom: A Functional Analysis," Social Forces, 33:326-335 (May 1955). See also, L.E. Atwood and Gerald L. Grotta, "Socialization of News Values in Beginning Reporters," Journalism Quarterly, 50:759-761 (Winter 1973).

[9] See, for example, John A. Kaufman, "Effectiveness of Bilateral and Unilateral Newspaper Administrative Structure," Newspaper Research Journal, 3:54-64 (October 1981); or Diana Tillinghast, "The Los Angeles Times: Weakening of Territorial Imperative," Newspaper Research Journal, 1:18-26 (May 1980).

[10] Even the cartoonist's kindred spirit--the editorial writer--has received attention. See: Dan G. Drew and G. Cleveland Wilhoit, "The Politics, Community Participation and Profile of the Editorial Writer," Journalism Quarterly, 50:638-644 (Winter 1973); John L. Huiteng, "Public Conceptions of Influences on Editorial Page Views," Journalism Quarterly, 46:362-364 (Summer 1969); Ernest C. Hynds and Charles H. Martin, "Editorial Writers Tell How They Go About Their Work," Journalism Quarterly, 54:776-779 (Winter 1977); and Joseph L. Morrison, "A 'Good' Afghanistanism: W.J. Cash as an Editorialist of the South," Journalism Quarterly, 44:693-701 (Winter 1967).

[11] The value of multiple levels of analysis in explorations of activities or phenomena is lucidly developed in Paul M. Hirsch, "Occupational, Organizational, and Institutional Models in Mass Media Research: Toward an Integrated Framework," in Hirsch, Peter Miller and F. Gerald Kline, eds., Strategies for Communication Research (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1977), pp. 13-42. More recent discussion has been provided by D. Charles Whitney in "Mass Communicator Studies: Similarity, Difference, and Level of Analysis," in James S. Ettema and Whitney, eds., Individuals in Mass Media Organizations: Creativity and Constraint (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1982), pp. 241-254.

12 She suggests that restructuring of newsrooms into "autonomous work groups" may benefit both staff and management in the newspaper industry. Cary B. Ziter, "The Autonomous Work Group in Journalism," Newspaper Research Journal, 1:46-50 (May 1980).

13 John W.C. Johnstone, "Organizational Constraints on Newswork," Journalism Quarterly, 53:5-13 (Spring 1976).

14 Stuart H. Schwartz, "Inner-directed and Other-directed Values of Professional Journalists," Journalism Quarterly, 55:721-725, 754 (Winter 1978).

15 Harold C. Shaver, "Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction Among Journalism Graduates," Journalism Quarterly, 55:54-61, 108 (Spring 1978).

16 Ruth C. Flegel and Steven H. Chaffee, "Influence of Editors, Readers and Personal Opinion on Reporters," Journalism Quarterly, 48:645-651 (Winter 1971).

17 Culbertson, op. cit., p. 9.

18 Ibid., p. 8.

19 Ibid., especially Figure 1, p. 8.

20 John C. Merril, The Imperative of Freedom: A Philosophy of Journalistic Autonomy (New York: Hastings House, 1974). See also his Existential Journalism (New York: Hastings House, 1977).

21 A degree of freedom which varied depending on organizational size. See Johnstone, op. cit., pp. 7, 11.

22 Interestingly, a larger percentage--nearly 72%--of the editors acknowledge these meetings. See Johnstone, op. cit., p. 11.

23 Ted Joseph, "Reporters' and Editors' Preferences Toward Reporter Decision-making," Journalism Quarterly, 59:219-222, 248 (Summer 1982). See also his, "Existing Decision-making Practices on American Dailies," Newspaper Reserach Journal, 2:56-60 (July 1981); and "Decision-making Preferences and Practices," Newspaper Research Journal, 3:37-44 (April 1982).

[24] Sharon Dunwoody, "News-gathering Behaviors of Specialty Reporters: A Two-level Comparison of Mass Media Decision-making," Newspaper Research Journal, 1:29-41 (November 1979). And, as Joseph, op. cit., points out, correspondents covering foreign news are given considerable freedom. See Lou Cannon, Reporting: An Inside View (Sacramento: California Journal Press, 1977).

[25] As fans--and critics--of investigative reporters will attest. See Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein, All the President's Men (New York: Warner Books, Inc., 1975) for anectdotal evidence.

[26] Culbertson, op. cit., particularly Table 11, p. 27.

[27] "Status" refers to "star" versus "veteran" versus 'cub" distinctions that are part of the newsroom pecking order, suggested by, among others, Leon Sigal, in his Reporters and Officials (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Co., 1973).

[28] See footnote 3, supra.

[29] Hynds, op. cit., p. 13.

[30] Steven H. Chaffee and Jack M. McLeod, "Sensitization in Panel Design: A Coorientational Experiment," Journalism Quarterly, 45:661-669 (Winter 1968); and Jack M. McLeod and Steven H. Chaffee, "Interpersonal Approaches to Communication Research," American Behavioral Scientist, 16:469-499 (1973).

[31] Ibid.

[32] Editor & Publisher International Yearbook (New York: Editor and Publisher, 1981).

[33] This and subsequent comparisons to Hynds' study refer to the reports indicated in footnote 3, supra.

[34] Comparable central tendency and dispersion scores were not provided in the Hynds studies.

35 In fact, age was not a significant factor when tested in analyses not reported here.

36 Roles were paired and subjects asked to choose which of the two was the better description. All possible pairs of roles were offered and, in data analysis, the roles most often chosen were given higher ranks.

37 We do not presume exhaustiveness of this list of roles, derived from our exploration of literature, including Hynds' studies and those less systematic treatments of cartooning referenced in footnotes 4, 5 and 6, supra.

38 Statistical procedures are based on John E. Freund, Statistics: A First Course, Third Edition (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1981) and Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956).

39 Jim Borgman (editorial cartoonist for the Cincinnati Enquirer), "The Editorial Page Editor and the Cartoonist Look at Each Other--Part II: At the Cincinnati Enquirer," The Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, September 1983, p. 10.

40 Bruce J. Biddle, Role Theory Expectations, Identities, and Behaviors (New York: Academic Press, 1979) p. 200.

41 Robert Stiff, editor of the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Evening Independent in personal interview with authors (Sneed), June 1981.

TABLE ONE

Cartoonists' and Editors' Views of the Cartoonist's Role,
By Rank

	How the Cartoonists:		How the Editors:	
	A. Describe Their Role[a]	B. Think Editors Perceive That Role[b]	C. Describe The Cartoonist's Role[a]	D. Think Cartoonists Describe That Role[b]
Critic	1	1	1	1
Artist	2	3	4	4
Opinion Leader	3	4	2	2
Entertainer	4	2	5	3
Judge	5	7	3	5.5
Reporter	6	5	7	7
Teacher	7	6	6	5.5

BETWEEN-RANK CORRELATIONS (Spearman's rho): AB=.79, AC=.79, AD=.83, BC=.39, BD=.78, CD=.81. All except BC are significant at the $p=.05$ level.

[a] These rankings obtained by method of paired comparisons.

[b] These rankings obtained by direct ranking.

Frequencies of Cartoonists and Editors
Who Attribute Their Own Perception
Of the Cartoonist's Role to
Their Counterparts[a]

	Roles "match"	Roles differ	
	f	f	(n)
Cartoonists	29	68	(97)
Editors	31	38	(69)

[a] Overall chi-square, with 1 df, is 3.946 (p l.t. .05).

TABLE TWO

Autonomy-related Beliefs of Cartoonists and Editors

	Cartoonist $\bar{X}$ (n)	Editor $\bar{X}$ (n)
A cartoonist should be free from all editorial restraints.	3.1[illegible][a] (96)	1.913[b] (69)
Establishing a certain quota of cartoons is a factor in the production of good cartoons.	3.083 (96)	3.000 (66)
The opinions conveyed in your published cartoons reflect those of your newspaper.	3.158 (95)	3.333 (69)

[a] The higher the mean score, the greater the agreement (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree).

[b] Differs significantly from cartoonist mean score (p l.t. .0001, by the Z-test for differences between means of independent samples).

Frequencies of cartoonists and editors who believe that the number of cartoons submitted each week is:[a]

	Too Many f	About Right f	Too Few f	(n)
Cartoonists	13	61	16	(90)
Editors	0	46	17	(63)

[a] Overall chi-square, with 2 df is 10.69 (p l.t. .01).

(continued)

TABLE TWO
(continued)

Frequencies of cartoonists and editors who believe that the "ideal" decision-making procedure on which cartoons to publish is:[a]

	Editor Decides f	Cartoonists & Editor Decide f	Cartoonist Decides f	(n)
Cartoonist	1	53	41	(95)
Editors	25	41	1	(67)

[a] Overall chi-square, with 2 df is 58.714 (p l.t. .001).

Cartoonists' and Editors' "Best" Sources of Cartoon Ideas, By Rank[a]

	Cartoonist Rank	Editor Rank
The cartoonist's own ingenuity	1	1
Magazine and newspaper articles	2	3
Reporters and their stories.	3	2
Radio and television.	4	5
The cartoonist's editors.	5	4
Other cartoonists.	6	7
Readers' suggestions	7	6
Other sources.	8	8

[a] The between-ranks correlation (Spearman's rho) is .893 (significant at p = .01 level).

TABLE THREE

Cartoonist and Editor Views on the Position of the Newspaper and Each Other, On Six Types of Issues[a]

	How the Cartoonists:		How the Editors:	
	Describe Themselves	Think the Editors View the Paper	Describe The Paper	Think the Cartoonists View Paper
	$\bar{X}$ (n)	$\bar{X}$ (n)	$\bar{X}$ (n)	$\bar{X}$ (n)
Political issues	3.146 (89) — b — 2.791 (86)		2.985 (65)	2.804 (51)
Social issues	3.528 (89) — b — 3.106 (85)		3.385 (65)	3.137 (51)
Economic issues	2.787 (89) — b — 2.429 (84)		2.462 (65)	2.686 (51)
Ecology	3.511 (88) — b — 3.118 (85)		3.385 (65)	3.208 (48)
Defense issues	3.146 (89) — b — 2.529 (85)		2.723 (65)	2.784 (51)
Foreign issues	3.125 (88) — b — 2.635 (85)		— b — 2.954 (65)	2.941 (51)

[a] The higher the mean score, the more "liberal" the description.

[b] Means joined by line are significantly different at the $p = .05$ level, by the Z-test for differences between means of independent samples.

TABLE FOUR

Cartoonist and Editor Beliefs On The Characteristics of Good Cartoons

	Cartoonist	Editor
	$\bar{x}$ (n)	$\bar{x}$ (n)
Agree that: "Cartoonists should not have to depend upon a caption to make a point."[a]	3.51[a] (94)	3.67 (69)
Agree that: "An editorial cartoon generally has a moral purpose.	3.90[a] (97)	3.72 (68)
Score on the importance of:[b]		
"Good art"	4.26[c] (96)	4.51 (69)
"Good caption"	3.84[c] (94)	3.48 (67)
"Humor"	3.92 (92)	4.10 (67)
"A strong idea"	4.94 (97)	4.93 (69)

[a] The higher the mean, the greater the agreement (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree).

[b] The higher the mean score, the greater the importance (1=Very Unimportant, 5=Very Important).

[c] The difference between the two independent samples' means is significant beyond the $p = .05$ level, by the Z-test.